

REMARKS

I. Introduction.

Claims 1-20 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 21-23 have been added. Claims 16 and 17 have been withdrawn from consideration as directed to non-elected species. An objection was made to Claim 6. Claims 1-5, 10, 11, 15, 18, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) in view of two different references. Claim 20 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b). Claims 9, 13, and 14, and Claims 6-8 were the subject of two separate rejections under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a).

II. The Objection to Claim 6.

Claim 6 has been amended to delete the recitation "(“PVP”)”.

III. The 35 U.S.C. Section 102 Rejections.

A. The Rejection of Claims 1-5, 10, 11, 15, 18, and 19 in View of Moore, Jr.

Claims 1-5, 10, 11, 15, 18, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,865,143 issued to Moore, Jr.

U.S. Patent 5,865,143 issued to Moore, Jr. is directed to a high-rise laying hen rearing facility and method that involves spraying liquid alum (aluminum sulfate) over a manure collection area.

The Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn. The Moore, Jr. reference, among other things, does not teach or disclose an allergen neutralization composition for use on household surfaces, that comprises an effective amount of an allergy neutralizing aluminum ion to neutralize at least some allergens when said composition is applied to household surfaces.

B. The Rejection of Claims 1-5, 10, 11, 15, 18, and 19 in View of Brown, et al.

Claims 1-5, 10, 11, 15, 18, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,331,653 issued to Brown, et al.

U.S. Patent 4,331,653 issued to Brown, et al. is directed to a styptic composition for curtailing bleeding and administering a soothing sensation on an injured area. The styptic composition is in the form of a lotion or cream, and contains from about 0.5% to about 25% by weight of an acidic metallic salt.

The Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn. The Brown, et al. reference, among other things, does not teach or disclose an allergen neutralization composition for use on household surfaces, that comprises an effective amount of an allergy neutralizing aluminum ion to neutralize at least some allergens when said composition is applied to household surfaces, or a composition in the form of an aqueous liquid.

C. The Rejection of Claim 20.

Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being anticipated by Brown, et al. and evidenced by U.S. Patent 4,806,526 issued to Green.

The Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn. Claim 20 is dependent from Claim 1, and, therefore, is also distinguishable from the Brown, et al. reference for the same reasons as Claim 1. Further, this rejection is not proper because a 35 U.S.C. Section 102 rejection cannot be based upon more than one reference.

IV. The 35 U.S.C. Section 103 Rejections.

A. The Rejection of Claims 9, 13, and 14.

Claims 9, 13, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,331,653 issued to Brown, et al.

The Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn. Claims 9, 13, and 14 are directly or indirectly dependent from Claim 1, and, therefore, are also distinguishable from the Brown, et al. reference for the same reasons as Claim 1.

B. The Rejection of Claims 6-8.

Claims 6-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,331,653 issued to Brown, et al. in view of U.S. Patent 5,916,541 issued to Stewart.

The Stewart reference is directed to a water resistant sunscreen and insect repellent composition.


The Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn. Claims 6-8 are directly or indirectly dependent from Claim 1, and, therefore, are also distinguishable from the Brown, et al. reference for the same reasons as Claim 1. The combination of the Stewart reference with the Brown, et al. reference does not overcome the deficiencies in the teachings of the Brown, et al. reference.

V. Summary.

Claim 6 has been corrected as suggested. The 35 U.S.C. Section 102 and 103 rejections have been addressed. In view of the foregoing, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FOR: Akikazu (nmn) Yoshikawa, et al.

By: 
Jeffrey W. Bamber
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 31,148
(513) 627-4597

August 27, 2003
Customer No. 27752